

Comment on “Linking solar and long baseline terrestrial neutrino experiments”

In the recent letter [1], it has been said that the measurements of U_{e3} would help discriminate between the possible solar neutrino solutions under the natural conditions with the neutrino mass hierarchies of $m_1 \ll m_2 \ll m_3$ and $m_1 \sim m_2 \gg m_3$, where m_i is the i -th generation neutrino absolute mass. However, in general the value of U_{e3} cannot predict the solar neutrino solutions without one additional nontrivial condition as the following reasons [2]. Neglecting the CP phases in the lepton sector, the number of independent parameters in the Majorana mass matrix of neutrino are six. Five parameters are enough to determine the MNS matrix, since overall factor in the neutrino mass matrix does not contribute to the MNS matrix. Thus we need five input parameters in order to determine the MNS matrix, and its element U_{e3} . Since the neutrino oscillation experiments except for the CHOOZ give us only four input parameters Δm_{ATM}^2 , Δm_{sol}^2 , $\sin^2 2\theta_{12}$, and $\sin^2 2\theta_{23}$, the value of U_{e3} remains as an unknown parameter, which we only know the upper bound from CHOOZ experiments as $U_{e3} < 0.16$ [3]. Therefore if we would like to predict the solar neutrino solutions from the value of U_{e3} , one additional nontrivial condition must be needed [2]. In Ref. [1], they have denoted $\varepsilon \equiv \alpha + \beta$ and $\varepsilon' \equiv \alpha - \beta$, where $\alpha \equiv \sqrt{2}U_{e3}(1 - (m_1 \cos^2 \theta_{12} + m_2 \sin^2 \theta_{12})/m_3)$ and $\beta \equiv \sqrt{2}(m_2 - m_1) \cos \theta_{12} \sin \theta_{12}/m_3$, and said that $\varepsilon + \varepsilon'$ and $\varepsilon - \varepsilon'$ are expected to be of the same order if there are no accidental cancellations. However, α is the free parameter which has nothing to do with β at all. Therefore, the condition $\varepsilon + \varepsilon' \simeq \varepsilon - \varepsilon'$ means $\alpha \simeq \beta$, which is not the natural condition but just the trivial assumption.

What are considerable nontrivial conditions from the theoretical point of view? How about introducing the new lepton number symmetry conservation, for example, $L_{\text{new}} \equiv L_e - L_\mu - L_\tau$ [4]? It is useful only for the case of $m_1 \sim m_2 \gg m_3$ with bi-maximal mixing (case(b2)) [5] [6]. In this case the L_{new} symmetric mass in (1,2) and (1,3) elements in the neutrino mass matrix are leading, and other L_{new} symmetry breaking elements are negligibly small. If elements of (1,2) and (1,3) are the same order including the L_{new} symmetry breaking order, we can obtain the relation between U_{e3} and $\sin \theta_{12}$ as

$$U_{e3} \simeq (1 - \sin 2\theta_{12}) \left(\frac{m_3}{m_1} - \frac{|m_2| - |m_1|}{2m_1} \right)^{-1}. \quad (1)$$

However, the equality of (1,2) and (1,3) elements including the L_{new} symmetry breaking order is the trivial assumption again. In other cases of mass hierarchies of $m_1 \ll m_2 \ll m_3$ and $m_1 \sim m_2 \gg m_3$, the relations induced from the condition that the elements of (1,2) and (1,3) are the same order [1] are also trivial [2], since there are no physical reason.

For another theoretical nontrivial condition, how about considering the situation of the maximal mixing between the second and the third generations and the zero mixing between the first and the third generations at the high energy scale? In this case the quantum corrections can change the mixing angles and mass squared differences [6]. Let us pick up the case of $m_1 \sim -m_2 \sim m_3$ (case (c2) in Ref. [6]), and estimate the quantum effects. When the effect of quantum corrections is large enough to neglect neutrino mass differences, the mixing angles of the MNS matrix approach to certain fixed angles [6]. In the large limit of quantum collections the relation between the values of U_{e3} and U_{e2} is obtained as

$$U_{e3} = U_{e2} \sqrt{\frac{1 - U_{e2}^2}{1 + U_{e2}^2}} \quad (2)$$

at the low energy independently of the mass squared differences. This determines the values of U_{e3} according to the values of mixing angles of the solar neutrino solutions, which are given by

$$U_{e3} \simeq 0.4 \quad (\text{large angle}), \quad 0.016 \quad (\text{small angle}). \quad (3)$$

This means that the large angle solutions are not consistent with the CHOOZ experiment. Also in the small angle solution, the mass squared differences $\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2 \simeq m_1^2 \eta$ and $\Delta m_{\text{ATM}}^2 \simeq \text{Max} [m_1^2 \eta^2, m_1^2 \eta \sin^2 \theta_{12}]$, can not suggest the suitable MSW solution [6], where

$$\eta \simeq \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \frac{m_\tau}{v^2} (1 + \tan^2 \beta) \ln \left(\frac{m_h}{m_z} \right). \quad (4)$$

Here we have suggested two theoretical conditions in order to obtain the relation between U_{e3} and $\sin \theta_{12}$. However, in the first condition the equality of symmetry breaking elements must be needed, which is trivial assumption. In the second condition, we cannot obtain suitable mass squared difference. Thus, in order to obtain the nontrivial relation between the solar neutrino solutions and the value of U_{e3} , there must be another nontrivial condition.

N. Haba and Tomoharu Suzuki

Department of Physics, Nagoya University,
Nagoya, Japan 464-8602

-
- [1] E.Kh. Akhmedov, G.C. Branco, and M.N. Rebelo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84** (2000) 3535.
 - [2] N. Haba and T. Suzuki, hep-ph/0006281.
 - [3] M. Apollonio *et al*, The CHOOZ Collaboration, Phys. Lett. **B466** (1999) 415.
 - [4] R. Barbieri, L.J. Hall, D. Smith, A. Strumia, N. Weiner, JHEP 9812 (1998) 017
 - [5] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, JHEP 9811 (1998) 021.
 - [6] N. Haba and N. Okamura, Eur. Phys. J. C14. (2000) 347.